



104

**THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M No.21673 of 2025

Date of Decision: 25.04.2025

Harpreet Singh @ Happy

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Surmeet Singh Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.379, dated 06.12.2023, under Section 379 of Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station City Kapurthala, District Kapurthala (Annexure P-1) on account of false implication of the petitioner.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was registered on 06.12.2023 on the statement of Assistant Engineer/Division, Urban Sub Division No.2, Punjab State Power Corporation Limited, Kapurthala. The allegations as reflected from the reading of the FIR were regarding the theft of the oil from the transformer. During the investigation, complicity of the petitioner was prima facie found. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner approached the



Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kapurthala praying for the grant of bail, wherein the petitioner was granted interim bail by the learned trial Court vide order dated 19.10.2024 and he was directed to join the investigation within 10 days but the petitioner failed to join the investigation. Thereafter the petitioner again approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kapurthala and by imposing the cost of Rs.10,000/-, the petitioner was granted 05 days time to join the investigation vide order dated 25.03.2025. As the petitioner failed to join the investigation within 05 days as directed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kapurthala, the interim bail granted by the learned Court automatically became inoperative. Hence the petitioner has approached this Court by way of filing the present petition praying for the grant of anticipatory bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended before this Court that the petitioner was granted the interim bail by the learned trial Court but inadvertently he failed to join the investigation. He has submitted that the petitioner has not been declared as proclaimed offender and thus he deserves to be granted anticipatory bail.

4. Heard.

5. On hearing learned counsel for the petitioner and perusing the record, it is apparent that the petitioner had granted the interim bail by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge initially on 19.10.2024 by granting him a period of 10 days for joining investigation. He failed to comply with the said order and thereafter the petitioner was allowed to



join the investigation within 05 days by imposing the cost of Rs.10,000/- vide order dated 25.03.2025 but the petitioner neither paid the cost nor joined the investigation.

6. The Court cannot ignore the fact that the petitioner is before this Court praying for the grant of anticipatory bail which is an extraordinary jurisdiction. From the conduct of the petitioner, it is apparent that the petitioner has no respect and regard for compliance of the orders, which are passed by the learned Court exercising their extraordinary jurisdiction.

7. For the consideration of anticipatory bail, the statutory parameters are given under Section 482 (1) & (2) BNSS which reads as under:-

“Direction for grant of bail to person apprehending arrest:

1. *When any person has reason to believe that he may be arrested on an accusation of having committed a non-bailable offence, he may apply to the High Court or the Court of Session for a direction under this section; and that Court may, if it thinks fit, direct that in the event of such arrest, he shall be released on bail.*
2. *When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-*
 - (i) *a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;*
 - (ii) *a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;*



- (iii) *a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;*
- (iv) *such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section."*

8. As per the law settled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in ***Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia Vs. State of Punjab***, AIR 1980 SC 1632, while granting anticipatory bail, the Court is to maintain a balance between the individual liberty and the interest of society. However, the interest of the society would always prevail upon the right of personal liberty. The relevant part of the judgment is as follows:-

“31. *In regard to anticipatory bail, if the proposed accusation appears to stem not from motives of furthering the ends of justice but from some ulterior motive, the object being to injure and humiliate the applicant by having him arrested, a direction for the release of the applicant on bail in the event of his arrest would generally be made. On the other hand, if it appears likely, considering the antecedents of the applicant, that taking advantage of the order of anticipatory bail he will flee from justice, such an order would not be made. But the converse of these propositions is not necessarily true. That is to say, it cannot be laid down as an inexorable rule that anticipatory bail cannot be granted unless the proposed accusation appears to be actuated by mala fides; and, equally, that anticipatory bail must be granted if there is no fear that the applicant will abscond. There are several other considerations, too numerous to enumerate, the combined effect of which must weigh with the court while granting or rejecting anticipatory bail. The nature and seriousness of the*



proposed charges, the context of the events likely to lead to the making of the charges, a reasonable possibility of the applicant's presence not being secured at the trial, a reasonable apprehension that witnesses will be tampered with and "the larger interests of the public or the state" are some of the considerations which the court has to keep in mind while deciding an application for anticipatory bail. The relevance of these considerations was pointed out in State v. Captain Jagjit Singh (1962) 3 SCR 622, which, though, was a case under the old Section 498 which corresponds to the present Section 439 of the Code. It is of paramount consideration to remember that the freedom of the individual is as necessary for the survival of the society as it is for the egoistic purposes of the individual. A person seeking anticipatory bail is still a free man entitled to the presumption of innocence. He is willing to submit to restraints on his freedom, by the acceptance of conditions which the court may think fit to impose, in consideration of the assurance that if arrested, he shall be enlarged on bail."

9. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***State Vs. Anil Sharma***, (1997) 7SCC 187, held as under:-

“6. *We find force in the submission of the CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation oriented than questioning a suspect who is well ensconced with a favorable order under Section 438 of the Code. In a case like this effective interrogation of a suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disinterring many useful informations and also materials which would have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if*



the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail order during the time he is interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual. The argument that the custodial interrogation is fraught with the danger of the person being subjected to third-degree methods need not be countenanced, for, such an argument can be advanced by all accused in all criminal cases. The Court has to presume that responsible police officers would conduct themselves in a responsible manner and that those entrusted with the task of disinterring offences would not conduct themselves as offenders.”

10. Weighing the facts of the case on the anvil of the law settled, it is apparent that the complicity of the petitioners has been prima facie found. Needless to say, the investigation is at the initial stage and in the facts and circumstances, custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be essential and granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner at this stage would scuttle the ongoing investigation.

11. In view of the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court does not find any ground for exercising its extraordinary jurisdiction in favour of the petitioner and thus, the present petition is hereby dismissed. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

25.04.2025

rittu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE